UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/753,514	01/04/2001	Yasuyuki Fujikawa	1506.1002 (JDH)	3098

			EXAMINER
21171	7590	05/16/2006	SAIN, GAUTAM

STAAS & HALSEY LLP
SUITE 700
1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2176	

DATE MAILED: 05/16/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *21 February 2006*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1,2 and 4-15* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1,2, 4-15* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *2/7/06, 2/21/06*.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1)   This is a Final rejection in response to the amendments/remarks filed 2/21/06.

2)   Claims 1, 2, 4-15 are pending and rejected in this rejection. Claim 3 was

previously cancelled.

3)   The effective filing date is 2/4/00 (based on foreign priority).

4)   Rejection under 35 USC 101 is withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5)   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5-1)   Claims 4, 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

<u>Kuwahara</u> (US 6202072, filed Dec 1997).

Claim 4, Kuwahara suggests the amendments to the claim "wherein said ... lower-order

hierarchy", "said retrieving ... higher-order hierarchy" and "said structured document ...

lower-order hierarchy" (ie., for conversion from plain text to an SGML document with

the document having a specific form by referring to the conversion table, using a

document type definition, thereafter adding adding tags to data that is arranged in a

hierarchical manner (where staff encompasses name and department date, as shown in

fig 2) and the tags are flank the content data ("development" inputed in the position in

between the <Department> and </Department> tags)(col 3, lines 5-24; col 6, lines 2-10;

lines 40-50; Fig 2, "Document Type Definition"; Fig 1, items 108 to item 102; Fig 3, item

(b) to (c) to (d) shows the plain text, hierachical structure and SGML output)

Kuwahara does not expressly teach "repetitive structure" but does suggest it,

because Kuwahara teaches that the prior art teaches a repetitive structure (ie.,

conventional technology generates every time for the entire document type definition

processing instead of only once)(col 2, lines 45-50), showing that the repetitive is

already well known in the conventional art.

The examiner reasonably interprets the claim limitation of "element in a higher-

order hierarchy embraces an element in a lower-order hierarchy that has a repetitive

structure" as a structure that has one or more children elements in structure under any

given parent element.   Based on examiner's interpretations, Kuwhara's disclosure of

the document type definition in Fig 2 is equivalent to the claimed limitation because the

document type definition structure of fig 2 shows a parent element "STAFF" (equivalent

to higher-order), which embraces two children, "NAME" and "DEPARTMENT" (lower-

order). The examiner interprets Kuwahara showing multiple children under one parent

as equivalent to a repetitive structure because it is a structure that repeats children

elements (lower-order).

Additionally, Kuwahara discloses correlating each of the fields with each of the

tags, respectively (col 8, lines 21-31). The examiner interprets this as equivalent to

repetitive because the correlations process repeats itself for each of the fields in the

document, which implies that it correlates all of the fields and repeats until all of the

fields are correlated.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Kuwahara to includes generating conversion tables every time (instead of once) as suggest in the prior art of conventional technology, providing the benefit correlating fields of the prototype document to tags of the document type definition when converting plain text to SGML (Kuwahara, col 2, lines 36-44).

Claim 5, Kuwahara suggests the amendments to the claim "wherein said ... lower-order hierarchy", (ie., for conversion from plain text to an SGML document with the document having a specific form by referring to the conversion table, using a document type definition, thereafter adding adding tags to data that is arranged in a hierarchical manner (where staff encompasses name and department date, as shown in fig 2) and the tags are flank the content data ("development" inputed in the position in between the <Department> and </Department> tags)(col 3, lines 5-24; col 6, lines 2-10; lines 40-50; Fig 2, "Document Type Definition"; Fig 1, items 108 to item 102; Fig 3, item (b) to (c) to (d) shows the plain text, hierachical structure and SGML output).

Kuwahara teaches "said retrieving module extracts [ ] conincident with one higher order hierarchy" (ie., the conversion of a plain text document having a *specific* form to a SGML document; examiner interprets that in order to have a specific form, there must be some condition of specificity in order to perform the conversion which is found out from the document type definition)(col 6, lines 13-36; col 5, lines 50-55 that necessitates a structure for each of the fields – name, department, and address which are the elements – in conjunction with the teachings of Nakatsuyma (see details below))(Fig 2,

"Document Type Definition"; Fig 1, items 108 to item 102; Fig 3, item (b) to (c) to (d)

shows the plain text, hierachical structure and SGML output).

Kuwahara does not teach "each region", but does suggest it, because Kuwahara

teaches that the prior art teaches a repetitive structure (ie., conventional technology

generates every time for the entire document type definition processing instead of only

once)(col 2, lines 45-50), showing that the repetitive is already well known in the

conventional art and in order for the repetitive processing, different areas have to be

processed as separate regions/areas.

Additionally, Kuwahara's Fig 2 illustrates the principles of the operations involved

in the preparations of a SGML conversion form based on the plain text document and

the document type definition. Specifically, Fig 2 shows a correlation between elements

from the plain text document and the document type definition and that the higher order

element of "STAFF" embraces lower order elements of "NAME" and "DEPARTMENT".

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to modify Kuwahara to includes generating conversion tables every time

(instead of once) as suggest in the prior art of conventional technology, providing the

benefit correlating fields of the prototype document to tags of the document type

definition when converting plain text to SGML (Kuwahara, col 2, lines 36-44).

5-2)   Claims 1, 2 and 6-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over <u>Kuwahara</u> (US 6202072, filed Dec 1997), in view of

<u>Nakatsuyama</u> et al (US 5752021, issued May 1998).

Regarding claim 1, Kuwahara teaches "a reading module ... an identifier

thereof" (ie., SGML conversion form generation module SGML document read-in

module)(col 5, lines 1-18, lines 59-65).

Kuwahara teaches "a retrieving module which refers to the extraction ... target

electronic document" (ie., the conversion of a plain text document having a *specific* form

to a SGML document; examiner interprets that in order to have a specific form, there

must be some condition of specificity in order to perform the conversion which is found

out from the document type definition)(col 6, lines 13-36; col 5, lines 50-55 that

necessitates a structure for each of the fields – name, department, and address which

are the elements – in conjunction with the teachings of Nakatsuyma (see details

below)).

Kuwahara teaches "a structure document generating module ... the definition

information" (ie., generate a SGML document from a plain text document prepared by a

user as part of the two directional conversion between plain text document and a SGML

document having a specific form)(col 4, lines 8-13).

Kuwahara suggests the amendments to the claim "wherein said ... lower-order

hierarchy", "said retrieving ... higher-order hierarchy" and "said structured document ...

lower-order hierarchy" (ie., for conversion from plain text to an SGML document with

the document having a specific form by referring to the conversion table, using a

document type definition, thereafter adding adding tags to data that is arranged in a

hierarchical manner (where staff encompasses name and department date, as shown in

fig 2) and the tags are flank the content data ("development" inputed in the position in

between the <Department> and </Department> tags)(col 3, lines 5-24; col 6, lines 2-10;

lines 40-50; Fig 2, "Document Type Definition"; Fig 1, items 108 to item 102; Fig 3, item

(b) to (c) to (d) shows the plain text, hierachical structure and SGML output).

Kuwahara does not expressly teach, but Nakatsuyama suggests "a condition of a

pattern of a character string of plain text data as" (col 3, lines 20-25, ie., retrieval

conditions on the basis of the retrieval formula for defining the structure of the document

data, lines 13-15).

It would have been obvious to one or ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to modify Kuwahara to include retrieval conditions on the basis of the retrieval

formula for defining the structure of document data as taught by Nakatsuyama,

providing the benefit of a document retrieving means to perform retrieval using semantic

description and the schema relating to the first schema and directed to the first retrieval

and converts the first formula to a second formula (Abstract section).

Regarding claim 2, Kuwahara teaches "a reading module ... an identifier

thereof" (ie., SGML conversion form generation module SGML document read-in

module)(col 5, lines 1-18, lines 59-65).

Kuwahara teaches "a retrieving module which refers to the extraction ... target

electronic document" (ie., the conversion of a plain text document having a *specific* form

to a SGML document; examiner interprets that in order to have a specific form, there

must be some condition of specificity in order to perform the conversion which is found

out from the document type definition)(col 6, lines 13-36; col 5, lines 50-55 that

necessitates a structure for each of the fields – name, department, and address which

are the elements – in conjunction with the teachings of Nakatsuyma (see details

below)).

Kuwahara teaches "a structure document generating module ... the definition

information" (ie., generate a SGML document from a plain text document prepared by a

user as part of the two directional conversion between plain text document and a SGML

document having a specific form)(col 4, lines 8-13).

Kuwahara suggests the amendments to the claim "said structured document ...

lower-order hierarchy" (ie., for conversion from plain text to an SGML document with

the document having a specific form by referring to the conversion table, using a

document type definition, thereafter adding adding tags to data that is arranged in a

hierarchical manner (where staff encompasses name and department date, as shown in

fig 2) and the tags are flank the content data ("development" inputed in the position in

between the <Department> and </Department> tags)(col 3, lines 5-24; col 6, lines 2-10;

lines 40-50; Fig 2, "Document Type Definition"; Fig 1, items 108 to item 102; Fig 3, item

(b) to (c) to (d) shows the plain text, hierachical structure and SGML output)

Kuwahara does not expressly teach, but Nakatsuyama suggests "a condition of a

pattern of a character string of plain text data as" (col 3, lines 20-25, ie., retrieval

conditions on the basis of the retrieval formula for defining the structure of the document

data, lines 13-15).

It would have been obvious to one or ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to modify Kuwahara to include retrieval conditions on the basis of the retrieval

formula for defining the structure of document data as taught by Nakatsuyama,

providing the benefit of a document retrieving means to perform retrieval using semantic

description and the schema relating to the first schema and directed to the first retrieval

and converts the first formula to a second formula (Abstract section).

Regarding claim 6, 7, Kuwahara teaches "extraction condition ... whole region

to be extracted" in claim 6 and "extraction condition ... end part thereof" in claim 7 (ie.,

Plain text document ... "document for Application" and corresponding end tag

"document for application")(fig 3, item c)(ie., correlation therebetween as one unit)(col 5,

lines 60-65).

Regarding claim 8, 9, Kuwahara teaches "description pattern ... to be extracted"

(ie., in the plain text document "application form for registering e-mail address"; data

displayed)(Fig 3, item a; col 6, lines 23-26).

Regarding claim 10, Kuwahara teaches "extraction condition ... syntax element

of the region to be extracted" (ie., text document is analyzed by software for syntax and

tags indicating a ... obtained syntax)(col 1, lines 31-40).

Regarding claim 11, Kuwahara teaches "reading ... text format", "reading ...

identifier thereof" (ie., conversion form generation module, document read-in

module)(col 5, lines 1-20, lines 59-63).

Kuwahara teaches "referring to ... reading step", "extracting ... electronic

document", "combining the regions ... definition information" (ie., specific form ..

concrete data ... name field, address field; data correlating)(col 6, lines 11-27; col 5,

lines 20-30; fig 2; fig 7, item 5).

Kuwahara teaches "generating ... definition information" (col 8, lines 33-38; fig 8).

Kuwahara does not expressly teach, but Nakatsuyama teaches "a condition of a

pattern of a character string of plain text data as" (col 3, lines 20-25, ie., retrieval

conditions on the basis of the retrieval formula for defining the structure of the document

data, lines 13-15).

It would have been obvious to one or ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to modify Kuwahara to include retrieval conditions on the basis of the retrieval

formula for defining the structure of document data as taught by Nakatsuyama,

providing the benefit of a document retrieving means to perform retrieval using semantic

description and the schema relating to the first schema and directed to the first retrieval

and converts the first formula to a second formula (Abstract section).

Regarding claim 12, Kuwahara teaches *reading plain text data; reading*

definition information that defines a correlation between elements as basic units

configuring a document structure of a structured document, and that defines, for each of

the elements [.] and an identifier thereof (ie., SGML conversion form generation module

SGML document read-in module)(col 5, lines 1-18, lines 59-65).

Kuwahara teaches *referring to the extraction condition per element that is*

defined by the reading definition information; extracting a region coincident with the per-

element extraction condition referred to out of the processing target electronic document

(ie., prototype file of a plain text document)(col 5, lines 27, fig 2, item 105).

Kuwahara teaches *combining the regions extracted with respect to the respective elements in accordance with the correlation between the respective elements that is defined by the definition information* (ie., generate a SGML document from a plain text document prepared by a user as part of the two directional conversion between plain text document and a SGML document having a specific form)(col 4, lines 8-13).

Kuwahara does not expressly teach, but Nakatsuyama teaches *a condition of a pattern of a character string of plain text data as* (col 3, lines 20-25, ie., retrieval conditions on the basis of the retrieval formula for defining the structure of the document data, lines 13-15).

Kuwahara discloses data correlation of files. Specifically, correlation of a plain text document having a specific form to a SGML document with a document type definition (col 5, lines 25-30; lines 35-40). The Examiner interprets Kuwahara's fields as equivalent to the claimed 'basic unit' (col 6, lines 33-34).

It would have been obvious to one or ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Kuwahara to include retrieval conditions on the basis of the retrieval formula for defining the structure of document data as taught by Nakatsuyama, providing the benefit of a document retrieving means to perform retrieval using semantic description and the schema relating to the first schema and directed to the first retrieval and converts the first formula to a second formula (Abstract section).

Regarding claim 13, Kuwahara teaches *generating the structured document by adding to each region an identifier defined by the definition information* (ie., generate a SGML document from a plain text document prepared by a user as part of the two

directional conversion between plain text document and a SGML document having a
specific form)(col 4, lines 8-13).

Regarding claim 14, Kuwahara teaches a *reading module that reads definition
information defining a correlation between elements as basic units configuring the
document structure, and defining, for each of the elements, [..] and an identifier thereof*,
(ie., SGML conversion form generation module SGML document read-in module)(col 5,
lines 1-18, lines 59-65).

Kuwahara teaches a *retrieving module which refers to the extraction condition
per element that is defined by the definition information read by said reading module,
and that extracts a region coincident with the per-element extraction condition referred
to out of the processing target electronic document* (ie., prototype file of a plain text
document)(col 5, lines 27, fig 2, item 105).

Kuwahara does not expressly teach, but Nakatsuyama teaches a *condition of a
pattern of a character string of plain text as an extraction condition* (col 3, lines 20-25,
ie., retrieval conditions on the basis of the retrieval formula for defining the structure of
the document data, lines 13-15).

It would have been obvious to one or ordinary skill in the art at the time of the
invention to modify Kuwahara to include retrieval conditions on the basis of the retrieval
formula for defining the structure of document data as taught by Nakatsuyama,
providing the benefit of a document retrieving means to perform retrieval using semantic
description and the schema relating to the first schema and directed to the first retrieval
and converts the first formula to a second formula (Abstract section).

Regarding claim 15, Kuwahara teaches *a structured document generating*

module that combines the regions extracted with respect to the respective elements by

said retrieving module in accordance with the correlation between the elements that is

defined by the definition information (ie., generate a SGML document from a plain text

document prepared by a user as part of the two directional conversion between plain

text document and a SGML document having a specific form)(col 4, lines 8-13).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 2/21/06 have been fully considered but they are not

persuasive.

Regarding Claims 1-2, 11-12 and 14, The Applicant argues that the

combination of references (Kuwahara and Nakatsuyama) does not teach

"condition of a pattern of a character string of plain text data" (Remarks, page 8,

Section I)

The Examiner disagrees, Kuwahara discloses a method for processing SGML

and converting between SGML and plain text using a prototype and document type

definition ("dtd") which generates a conversion table for converting between a document

having a specific form and a dtd by correlating fields of the document to tags when

converting a plain text document prepared by using the protype document to a SGML

document having tags (see Kuwahara, col 2, lines 36-45) and determination of the

degree of coincidence among the logical structures (col 2, line 67). The Examiner

interprets Kuwahara's determination of a coincidence and correlation of fields of the

document tags as equivalent to the claimed 'condition of a pattern' because in order to determine a coincidence and correlation of fields, some condition must be in place to make the decision that there is a coincidence or correlation of fields. The Examiner interprets Kuwahara's "input items in a plain text document" as equivalent to the claimed "plain text data".

Additionally, Kuwahara discloses data that is inputted in each of the fields of the plain text document (see Fig 9; col 8, lines 53-59) where "TOKKYO Taro" is in the name field. The field definition facilitates conversion of the plain text document facilitates the conversion of the plain text document having a specific form to a SGML document. See Fig 2, that illustrates the principles of the operations involved in the preparations of a SGML conversion form based on the plain text document and the document type definition. See Fig 3, that illustrates the principles of the operations involved in the conversion between a plain text document and a SGML document.

Regarding claim 12, The Applicant argues that the combination of references does not define a correlation between elements as <u>basic</u> units (Remarks, page 9, section II).

The Examiner disagrees. Kuwahara discloses data correlation of files. Specifically, correlation of a plain text document having a specific form to a SGML document with a document type definition (col 5, lines 25-30; lines 35-40). The Examiner interprets Kuwahara's fields as equivalent to the claimed 'basic unit' (col 6, lines 33-34).

Regarding Claim 4, The Applicant argues that the combination of references does not teach "an element in a lower-order hierarchy that has a repetitive structure" and then "retrieving module repeatedly extracts regions" (Remarks, page 9-10, section III).

The Examiner disagrees. The examiner reasonably interprets the claim limitation of "element in a higher-order hierarchy embraces an element in a lower-order hierarchy that has a repetitive structure" as a structure that has one or more children elements in structure under any given parent element. Based on examiner's interpretations, Kuwhara's disclosure of the document type definition in Fig 2 is equivalent to the claimed limitation because the document type definition structure of fig 2 shows a parent element "STAFF" (equivalent to higher-order), which embraces two children, "NAME" and "DEPARTMENT" (lower-order). The examiner interprets Kuwahara showing multiple children under one parent as equivalent to a repetitive structure because it is a structure that repeats children elements (lower-order).

Additionally, Kuwahara discloses correlating each of the fields with each of the tags, respectively (col 8, lines 21-31). The examiner interprets this as equivalent to repetitive because the correlations process repeats itself for each of the fields in the document, which implies that it correlates all of the fields and repeats until all of the fields are correlated.

Regarding Claim 5, The Applicant argues that the combination of
references does not teach "said retrieving module extracts [ ] coincident with one
higher order hierarchy" (Remarks, page 10 - page 11, section IV).

The Examiner disagrees because Fig 2 illustrates the principles of the operations
involved in the preparations of a SGML conversion form based on the plain text
document and the document type definition. Specifically, Fig 2 shows a correlation
between elements from the plain text document and the document type definition and
that the higher order element of "STAFF" embraces lower order elements of "NAME"
and "DEPARTMENT".

Additionally, Regarding Claim 5, The Applicant argues that there is no
support for Examiner's assertion for rejection the claim limitation "the elements
in lower-order hierarchy with reference to the extraction condition of the
sequenced element in the lower-order hierarchy out of a region from a portion
just after an already-extracted region" (see Remarks, page 11, Section IV) and
argues that this limitation would not have been obvious at the time of the
invention to modify the art to perform a repetitive process (remarks, pag 11,
section IV).

The Examiner disagrees because illustrates the principles of the operations
involved in the preparations of a SGML conversion form based on the plain text
document and the document type definition. Specifically, Fig 2 shows a correlation
between elements from the plain text document and the document type definition and

that the higher order element of "STAFF" embraces lower order elements of "NAME" and "DEPARTMENT".

Based on examiner's interpretations, Kuwhara's disclosure of the document type definition in Fig 2 is equivalent to the claimed limitation because the document type definition structure of fig 2 shows a parent element "STAFF" (equivalent to higher-order), which embraces two children, "NAME" and "DEPARTMENT" (lower-order).

Additionally, Kuwahara discloses correlating each of the fields with each of the tags, respectively (col 8, lines 21-31). The examiner interprets this as equivalent to repetitive because the correlations process repeats itself for each of the fields in the document, which implies that it correlates all of the fields and repeats until all of the fields are correlated.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gautam Sain whose telephone number is 571-272-4096. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9-5 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon can be reached on 571-272-4136. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

GS 4/8/06
GS

HEATHER R. HERNDON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100